view of the fact that various no-confidence motions have already been moved in several of the local bodies and municipalities, and also in view of the interference of Courts in some of them. I therefore think, Sir, that the House will give leave for this motion and vote for it."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" I second it."

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I think the hon. Member Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed has made a mistake in his reference to the items to be taken up. He must have said '6 and 7' instead of '4 and 5'."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I will put the motion correctly. The question is—

'that all the items on the agenda do stand postponed until Bills Nos. 9 and 10 have been disposed of'."

The motion was carried.

IV.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920 (BILL No. 9 OF 1932).

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" Sir, I beg to introduce the Bill[a] to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act (Bill No. 9 of 1932).

" Sir, this Bill is intended with a view to make amendments in the existing provision dealing with no-confidence motions in the District Municipalities Act. In regard to municipalities there have been several motions of no-confidence and the power to move no-confidence motion is being abused. It is considered necessary that provision should be made to eliminate as far as possible the abuse that is being made. There have been cases in which the Chairmen have refused to receive motions of no-confidence and rejected them. To obviate that difficulty it is necessary to amend the Bill. There have been cases in which two motions against the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman are tabled on the same day. Difficulty has been caused as to which of them should be admitted. The Bill provides for one of them being admitted in preference to the other. It also provides that once a motion of no-confidence is passed by a two-thirds majority the Chairman should be removed by Government by a notification. The object is to avoid the dispute as to whether there was a two-thirds majority or a bare majority. It also provides that once a motion of no-confidence is brought another motion should not be brought forward at least for six months, and also when once a motion is rejected or otherwise disposed of, there should not be a second motion for at least six months. These are the various amendments proposed to be made which are intended to minimize the difficulties which arise in connexion with the moving of no-confidence motions. These no-confidence motions have tended to create deadlocks and also deterioration in the efficiency of the administration. I feel there is a large volume of opinion that something should be done to reduce these evils. In that view this Bill has been introduced. I no doubt intended that we may pass the Bill immediately into law, but in view of the various amendments that have

[a] Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 26th July 1932.

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu] [4th August 1932

been given notice of and also in view of the fact that notice has been given by Members that the Bill may be considered by a Select Committee, I request you will allow me to move this Bill to amend the District Municipalities Act (Bill No. 9 of 1932)."

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I beg to second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Is the hon. Minister moving a motion to refer it to a Select Committee?"

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" With your permission, Sir, I beg to move—

'*that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members:*—

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu Garu.
Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur.
Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
,, M. S. Sreshta.
,, Daniel Thomas.
,, Mahboob Ali Baig.
The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
Mr. C. Basu Dev.
Dr. P. Subbarayan.
Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu.
,, T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
,, Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.
,, M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
,, P. Peddi Raju."

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—" I second it."

4–30 p.m. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur spoke in Tamil opposing the motion for referring the Bill to a Select Committee.

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" Sir, I also oppose the motion of the hon. the Chief Minister for referring this Bill to a Select Committee. This Bill seeks to amend only one section, viz., section 44 of the District Municipalities Act. The hon. the Chief Minister in his speech introducing the Bill said that this power of passing a vote of no-confidence given to local bodies had been much abused by the local bodies and that consequently there had been considerable deterioration in the administration of these local bodies. Therefore the sooner we nip this nefarious practice in the bud, the better. The hon. Minister gave notice of a motion for taking the Bill into consideration and several of us thinking that the Bill would be considered immediately gave notice of amendments to the clauses in the Bill. I am surprised that the hon. Minister should have changed his mind so soon and come forward with a motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. The Select Committee is absolutely unnecessary from another point of view also. The Select Committee would entail a lot of expenditure to the Government and it is undesirable that we should add to the expenses of the Government when they are finding it difficult to

4th August 1932] [Mr. V. T. Arasu]

make both ends meet. It is unfortunate that the hon. the Finance Member is not here just now. I am sure he will agree with me that we should not impose a burden on the financial resources of this Province by referring this Bill to a Select Committee. I therefore oppose the motion that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, and request that the Bill be taken into consideration at once."

Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur:—"Sir, in the ordinary course of events, when a Bill is brought forward, notice of the motion is given several weeks before the meeting of the Council in which it is to be introduced. Then it is referred to a Select Committee where its provisions are discussed in detail. But in this case the Bill was published in the Gazette on the 26th July—only five or six days ago. On account of the confusion in the section now proposed to be amended, several disputes have arisen and the persons concerned have referred the matter to civil courts. The drafting of the section has not been happy. The construction of the section, the desirability of the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman presiding over a meeting at which a motion of no-confidence is moved against him, the interference of the civil courts in all stages of the motion, and several such things have been discussed in the newspapers and elsewhere. I am sure many amendments should be brought to this Bill now before the House. I do not see any reason, unless one is personally affected or fears he would be losing his ground, why there should be any indecent haste in proceeding with this Bill. We have had a bitter experience of rushing through legislation and afterwards feeling sorry for it. I therefore urge that some time should be allowed for the House and the public to consider this matter calmly. I strongly support the motion for referring this Bill to a Select Committee."

* Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar:—"Sir, I was one of those who was very anxious to have this section amended as early as possible. Therefore when I first saw the Bill in the Gazette I was very glad that it was coming and hoped that it would be passed at once. But on further consideration I found that the Bill required some amendments and that it was better that it was discussed in a Select Committee. For instance, when a no-confidence motion is rejected or passed only by a bare majority, no such motion can be brought forward for another six months. I should like that in the case in which a no-confidence motion against a Chairman or Vice-Chairman has been totally rejected, another motion against the same persons should not be brought forward for a period of 12 months. They should be allowed to continue in office undisturbed for that period at least. I am glad to learn that we will soon be having executive officers for our municipalities; and a Bill to that effect will be introduced. Till then it is better that we allow Chairman or Vice-Chairman of municipalities against whom a no-confidence motion has been brought and rejected to continue in office undisturbed for another period of 12 months. These things can be discussed in the Select Committee. That is why I support the motion to refer this Bill to a Select Committee. With regard to the speech of the hon. Member from Tenkasi —I was recently at Tenkasi myself and I heard that a no-confidence motion was pending against him—I earnestly hope he would not be disturbed. There are many like him in the Presidency, but that is no

[Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar] [4th August 1932

consideration why we should rush through a measure like this. We will not lose much by postponing the Bill for three months. It is not proposed in this Bill to do away with no-confidence motions altogether. But it is proposed to restrict the scope of such motions. The best security of presidents of local boards and chairmen of municipal councils will be found in the confidence they are able to command from the members of these bodies. I therefore support the motion to refer this Bill to a Select Committee."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" The hon. Member Mr. Arasu charged me with changing my mind suddenly. I have to point out that this Bill was placed before the Advisory Committee on Local Self-Government and Public Health consisting of 22 members and I asked their opinion as to whether the Bill may be passed straightaway or referred to a Select Committee. They advised that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. My hon. friend Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar representing the Madras Corporation was one of the members of the Committee. He said that the Bill did not go as far as he would like it to go and that he would like to make radical changes in the Act even to the extent of removing the section relating to no-confidence motions. With regard to the amendments before us, they are not of an informal nature, they are substantial amendments. One amendment says that a no-confidence motion should not be introduced until six months after the election of a Chairman or Vice-Chairman. Mr. Muthiah Chettiyar wants that the interval should be not six months but one year. Another amendment says that there should be only one no-confidence motion and whether the majority is prescribed to be two-thirds or a bare majority, the motion should operate as soon as it is passed; there should be no provision for a second motion after some interval. In view of these various amendments and in view of the general feeling I thought it best to have the matter discussed in Committee so that it may come before the Council in a more satisfactory form. I fully realise the great abuse to which this power has been put and the urgent necessity of restricting this power to as narrow a margin as possible. If there is a strong body of opinion in favour of restricting this power, on behalf of the Government I am willing to accept it. These are the considerations which induced me to bring forward a motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. Of course I quite sympathise with the hon. Member from Tenkasi in his anxiety that the Bill should be passed now. But we have very little time at our disposal—only 15 minutes. Even if we make up our minds to take up the Bill now we shall not be able to pass it to-day."

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" Sir, as the hon. the Chief Minister has said that this is a very important measure which ought to be thrashed out in a Select Committee, I beg your leave and the leave of the House to move that S.O. 39 (2) be suspended and that the number of members of the Select Committee be increased to more than 15. If the leave is granted and you suspend the S.O., I shall give the names of the Members I want to add to the Select Committee."

4-45 p.m. * The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The hon. Member will move for both, suspension of the Standing Order and the addition of more names."

4th August 1932]

* Mr. V. T. Arasu :—" Sir, I request you to suspend Standing Order 39 (2) and to give me leave to add the names of the following gentlemen to the list of Members of the Select Committee already read out by the hon. the Chief Minister :—

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.
Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.
,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.
Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" I second it."

* The hon. the President :—" The question is—

'that the number of the Members of the Select Committee on this Bill excluding the Member of Government in charge, do exceed 15'."

The motion was lost.

* The hon. the President :—" The question is—

'that Bill No. 9 of 1932 (Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act) be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Members already read out by the hon. the Chief Minister'."

The motion was carried.

V.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920 (BILL No. 10 of 1932).

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu :—" Sir, I introduce the Bill[a] to amend the Madras Local Boards Act (Bill No. 10 of 1932) and move—

'that the Bill be referred to the same Select Committee as for Bill No. 9.'

" The object of this Bill is the same as that of the previous Bill. This is in connexion with the amendment of the sections in the Local Boards Act dealing with no-confidence motions. I have already explained the object of these Bills."

Mr. E. Conran Smith :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

VI.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS SERVICES COMMISSION ACT, 1929 (BILL No. 7 of 1932).

* The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

'that Bill No. 7 of 1932 be taken up next as it is urgent and as there are no amendments proposed to it'."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur :— " I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

---

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 26th July 1932.